



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/628,116	07/28/2000	Roman Sobolewski	M-8821 US	2593
24251	7590	12/17/2003	EXAMINER	
SKJERVEN MORRILL LLP 25 METRO DRIVE SUITE 700 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			MORAN, TIMOTHY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2878	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

WMA

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/628,116	SOBOLEWSKI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy J. Moran	2878

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27,30-33, and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 28,29,34 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed November 14, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Specifically, the Gupta and Kadin reference is not listed on the IDS and has not been considered.

Claim Objections

Claims 22-23 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. A method or detector which time resolves to 10 picoseconds is considered to inherently resolve to at least one nanosecond.

Claims 27, 33, 38, and 40 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term “4 Kelvin – 10 Kelvin” should be replaced with --4 K to 10 K--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not describe the resolution of incident times to within or better than 10 picoseconds. While the specification does describe pulse widths of 30 picoseconds, it is considered that additional guidance is necessary to achieve the inventions described in the claims. It is also noted that the term "to within or better than about 10 picoseconds" is understood to include inventions which resolve incident time to extremely small time durations such as 1 or 0.1 picoseconds.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Steps enabling an artisan to resolve the incident time to within or better than 10 picoseconds critical or essential to the practice of the inventions, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 26-27, 30, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification teaches that the superconducting film is not maintained in the superconducting state

during the detection process. As illustrated in fig. 2D, the specification teaches that a substantial portion of the strip is not in the superconducting state (page 7, lines 11-12).

Claims 26-27, 30, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. While the specification does teach detection by a superconducting strip with a substantial portion which is not in the superconducting state (fig. 2D), the specification does not teach steps enabling an artisan to detect photons with a strip which is maintained in the superconducting state.

See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification teaches that the superconducting film is in the superconducting transition region (page 6, lines 14-16, and abstract), not “below the superconducting transition region.” Note that the term “superconducting transition region” is understood to include regions which are near the superconducting transition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fenner, U. S. Patent No. 5,354,989. Regarding claim 25, Fenner describes a method of maintaining a superconducting strip below its critical temperature (see abstract), biasing it, directing photons toward said strip using a mirror (34, fig. 6, col. 4, lines 15-18), whereby the superconducting strip detects the photons.

Regarding claim 31, Fenner describes such a detector.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenner. Fenner does not teach the use of a cryogenic amplifier. However, use of cryogenic amplifiers is well known in the art of low temperature electronics. Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a cryogenic amplifier in the device of Fenner for the advantage of increased signal.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 28-29 and 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 28 and 34 include the limitations that a substrate has a superconducting strip detector on one side, and an antireflective coating on a second side.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 15, last three paragraphs and page 16, first paragraph, filed November 14, 2003, with respect to claims 20, 21, and 24 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 20, 21, and 24 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed November 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument (page 9, second paragraph) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., single photon detection) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) (claims 25 and 31). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Moran whose telephone number is 703-305-0849. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on 703-308-4852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9318.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/628,116
Art Unit: 2878

Page 8

T. M.

TM

December 12, 2003


DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800